

therein indirectly.

Richardson uses a digital code (code portion) which is a part of and derived from the digital data, wherein the code portion contains an algorithm which generates a registration number which is unique to the licensee, and sent to the licensor, whereat there is matching. If the matching is correct, then the licensee is allowed to use the digital data.

But, that is a simple prior art manufacturer's registration system. There is no unique identification information which is created by a dedicated creation program which after one execution is self destructed, and wherein the unique identification information is separated from the blank space after the program is terminated. In this way, in our invention, the software is only usable by the particular apparatus to which it belongs. Our invention is not like Richardson which must send the ID information on registration from the Licensee back to the Licensor for validation. Also, the unique ID which is filled into the blank space of the software in our invention is independent of the rest of the program body. In contrast, the manufacturer (licensor's registration number) registration of the particular software for the particular computer is placed in the same platform as the software program body, and is derived therefrom by the algorithm. In other words, the registration number from the Licensor is not independent of the software program, and must also be compared by the Licensor after communication thereof by the Licensee to the Licensor. The concepts are completely different, and no Sec. 102 "anticipation" can be concluded,

Our recited invention is nowhere close to Richardson. We use a "dedicated creation program" to create "an identification information uniquely for that said particular apparatus in the form of a run-time read module", which creation program is "self-destructed" after the "one execution in creating" such unique identification information.

As above discussed, Richardson does not do this. He does not have any "dedicated creation program" which creates the unique identification information, and then after that one "execution in creating" that identification information, is "self destructed".

In contrast, Richardson uses a Licensor provided registration number for that particular licensee, which registration number is obtained from the same platform as the digital data and from an algorithm contained in the code portion.

Richardson does not use a "dedicated creation program" to create the unique identification information, and then "self destructs" that program after "one execution in creating" that identification information.

Moreover, in our recited invention, the "run-time read module" is "separated from the blank area of the software program" after the program is "terminated". There is no such step provided by Richardson. Moreover, the Licensor registration system usually keeps such registration number more or less permanently. He does not separate same from the software program after use.

Finally, as above discussed, the software program of Richardson has a digital data and code portions. But, the two are not independent,

of each other. In other words, one cannot change for example, the code without changing the complete digital data portions. But, that is true with most Licensor sponsored registration systems.

In contrast, our "blank area" is independent of the "program body" of the software program. Note, we create the ID which is inserted into the "blank space". The ID is created by a dedicated program which is "self destructed" after executing the program. Then, after the program body is used and "terminated", then the ID information in the "blank area" is separated from the "blank area". Clearly, neither Richardson, nor any other known prior art uses such a concept of using a creation program to create a ID "run-time read module"; then "self destructing" that program; and placing the "run-time read module" in a "blank space" in a software program; using same to prevent unauthorized copying; and then after the software program is "terminated" separating the "run-time read module" from the blanks space. This procedure can then be repeated for other repeated uses.

In view of the foregoing, clearly, the Section 102 rejection is without foundation and should be withdrawn.

The inventor wishes to add the following technical comments. "The difference between our invention and the disclosure of USP5,490,216 is as follows: USP 5,490,216 ships the product which lacks the certified information. The product which has the code checking the information in the program is shipped."

"On the other hand, our invention ships the product which lacks

a part of the execution program. The self-destructive type certification program produces the part of the execution program. The executable program module is used for the certification. The self destructive type certification program reads the information but the information is not read at the execution."

"Thus, the amendments to claims 4-6 now clearly distinguish our invention over the cited reference"

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and allowance are respectfully solicited.

Respectfully

M. KOJIMA

MOONAY KOJIMA

BOX 627

WILLIAMSTOWN, MA 01267

Tel (413)458-2880

13 July 04